Leadership in Latin America: Insights into Complexities across Societies

Track: Culture, Social, and Ethical Issues

Keywords: Cross-cultural Leadership, Management in Latin America, Global Management

Leadership in Latin America: Insights into Complexities across Societies

Abstract

Although many cross-cultural leadership studies have been conducted in the past decade, relatively little attention has been paid to leadership in Latin America. Perceptions concerning the characteristics of outstanding leaders in Latin America and differences in leadership preferences across countries in the region present important issues that have yet to be investigated in the leadership literature. This paper presents a detailed analysis of the leadership findings from the seminal GLOBE Project for this region, plus the addition of the country Peru. Implications for future research and practice are also discussed.

The East versus West philosophical discussion has captivated academic and practitioner interests across disciplines from political science to management to anthropology (Chhokar, Brodbeck & House, 2007). In recent research, more attention has been given to the discussion of leadership differences across cultures and their implications for business leaders (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). Although hundreds of leadership studies have been conducted, very few studies have addressed leadership in Latin America.

The leadership literature is overwhelmingly dominated by North American conceptualizations and assessments of leadership, and even the literature on cultural differences in leadership focuses primarily on developed countries (Lenartowicz and Johnson, 2002). Even so, Latin American history and contemporary Latin American societies are filled with examples of leaders who exemplify a style reflective of broad Latin American values and practices, which differ from that elsewhere in the world. Indeed, some leadership styles may be considered Latin American, while others are specific to particular countries in the region (e.g., Colombian, Mexican, or Argentinean).

In today's economy, organizations face the challenge of operating across multiple cultures and with a diverse group of individuals who have different sets of values and preferences. In such dynamic environments, where organizations must learn to compete effectively to achieve growth, effective leaders become a key requirement for competitive success. With more attention being given to many Latin American countries generally, and to the BRIC country of Brazil specifically, a systematic description of what characterizes leadership in this region is necessary. This description will help businesses better understand and manage leadership differences across Latin American countries.

What type of leader is considered effective in Latin America? Are there differences across Latin American countries? Does the enactment of a specific leadership style vary across culture or country? These questions remain to be fully addressed in the literature. A general description of perceptions of good leadership in Latin America is useful on several fronts. Specifically, this information can help global managers obtain a clear perspective on what is valued in a leader and

what is not valued in Latin American culture and countries. Moreover, a detailed overview helps global leaders differentiate between leadership characteristics that are universally valued across Latin America and characteristics that are country-specific. An understanding of culturally endorsed differences in leadership concepts may be a first step that managers can take to adjust their leadership behavior to be more suited to perceived effective behaviors in the host country.

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. First, we seek to provide an in-depth description of leadership in Latin America as analyzed through the GLOBE Project. While the broad leadership findings of GLOBE are reported across the ten cultural clusters identified in prior research (House et al., 2004), a comprehensive evaluation of leadership within the region has not been undertaken yet. Furthermore, this paper includes data from Peru, which was not available in the original study. Having these data allows for a more comprehensive evaluation of leadership in the region, especially since Peru has been successful in emerging from high levels of poverty in the last couple decades to become one of the highest growth economies of the region and a major player in the Latin American market. In order to better understand the context of the Latin American region, a brief review of the history, demographics, social and economic factors are described in the next section.

The second purpose and contribution of this research is to offer initial insight into the nuances between countries concerning the perceptions of effective leadership. Although there may be a broad generalization for the larger region, there also can be specific behaviors that are associated with what appears to be the same leadership style, yet is enacted in different ways in different countries.

Background of Latin America

Latin America is made up of 20 countries in the central and southern regions of the American continent. Together these countries represent about 13% of the world's total land surface area. This geographic region inhabits about 590 million people of the 7 billion people on the planet, which is about 8% of the world's population. Brazil is the largest country and accounts for 36% of the population in Latin America and its official language is Portuguese.

Latin America is a cultural concept. It is based on the unifying roots of Latin European conquerors and emigrants from Spain, Portugal, Italy and France. These emigrants primarily have been the ruling elite of the region and have influenced the values and experiences of the people over many generations. As a result, Latin American countries are associated with languages that are based in Latin, and most countries speak Spanish. Furthermore, multiple research studies demonstrate that the countries in this region cluster together when their cultural values are compared to other countries in the world (Inglehart & Carballo, 2008; Ronen & Shankar, 1985; Schwartz, 2006). Latin America is racially mixed, and there are large inequalities associated with race. Indigenous populations do not carry the same status associated with European ancestors, and yet in some countries, like Guatemala and Bolivia, large indigenous groups have maintained their traditions, languages and territory, despite class differences.

A brief review of historical events sheds light on the class differences that continue today and the implications for perceptions of leadership. It was during the 16th century that conquerors from Spain and Portugal first arrived to Latin America, and subsequently a ruling class grew out of the governing power given to these early viceroys in the regions. By the 19th century, wars for independence were underway, and ruling authoritarian regimes throughout Latin America were challenged. While most countries in the region had long-standing authoritarian and military regimes during the 20th Century, some countries enjoyed democratic elections throughout nearly all the periods of presidencies (e.g., Costa Rica, Colombia). Notably, women started to vote in 1927 in Uruguay, and eventually were allowed to vote in all Latin American countries by the 1950s. However economic democracy in this region is far from being realized, and in some countries up to 50% or more of the population are living below the national poverty level.

Historical events have shaped the governmental institutions and practices for the countries in Latin America, as in any other region. The shared experiences among people in a country produce expectations regarding governance that become passed through generations, not only driving the policies and social structures put in place, but also affecting the cultural values and collective mental models (North, 1994). Historically, in Latin America those who emerged to lead social change and transitional governments relied on autocratic, populist, and paternalistic leadership styles (Martinez, 2005; Weyland, 2001). Autocratic styles draw on positional power, paternalism promises some form of protection and care in exchange for loyalty, and populist styles are based on claims that the leader serves the interests of the masses (versus elites and power groups). Through the years, these styles have provided a strong framework for the type of leader who perceived as effective in this region.

Prior Research on Latin American Leadership

Although the majority of the research on leadership has been conducted in developed countries, particularly in Europe and North America, a few studies have examined leadership in Latin America. Regarding general leadership styles in Latin America, Recht and Wilderom (1998) assert that autocratic and paternalistic leadership styles are the most common among Latin American countries. As argued by Davila & Elvira (2012) existing literature continues to portray the Latin American leader as an authoritarian-benevolent paternalistic figure based on general scale dimensions. Specifically, preference for autocratic leadership styles has been demonstrated in Chile (Abarca, Mujluf, & Rodríguez, 1999), Argentina (Majul, 1992), Bolivia (Camacho-García, 1996), and Mexico (Dorfman & Howell, 1997). Paternalism refers to making decisions for employees in a parental way that engenders care and loyalty, as well as protecting working relationships (Davila & Elvira, 2012; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2008). To this, research has shown that good working relationships with low conflict are valued in Latin American countries as reflected by a study conducted by Abarca et al. (1998) who found that Chilean personnel value pleasant and low conflict work relationships. Moreover, Lenartowicz and Johnson (2002) conducted a study

that compared managerial values of retail stores across 12 Latin American countries. This study showed similarity in managers' personal values relating to positive and civil social interactions and also showed significant differences in other work-related values (i.e., drive and self-direction).

In terms of evaluating leadership effectiveness in Latin America, research confirms relational approaches are central to managerial styles. Ogliastri (1998) found that effective leaders in Colombia are relationship oriented and interact well with others. Furthermore, Kras (1994) observed that Mexican managers also tend to be relationship oriented. Although scant, these research findings suggest some commonalities for leadership preferences across select Latin American countries.

To deepen our understanding about which leadership characteristics are most valued in Latin America, the literature on personal values provides further insight into this region. Currently, there are two contrasting viewpoints about personal values in Latin America. Some scholars argue that Latin American countries are culturally distinct, indicating that each country holds different values (Lenartowicz & Johnson, 2002). Conversely, some studies present Latin America as a culturally homogeneous region where the countries hold similar values. Recent evidence lends support to the latter argument (Esmer & Pettersson, 2007). Studies that have clustered countries based on attitudes or values have consistently found that Latin American countries tend to form a cluster (Inglehart & Carballo, 2008; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985; Schwartz, 2006). Of particular focus for this paper, the GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness) study shows Latin America as a relatively homogeneous region with shared cultural and work related values (Ogliastri et al., 1999; House et al., 2004)

The search for an explanation for homogeneity in attitudes and values among Latin American cultures is provocative. Although Latin America comprises many different countries, there are some values that are shared by all the countries within this region (Romero, 2004; Lozano, 1997; Veliz, 1980), and there is also a common culture at the core of Latin American countries. Unlike a more federalist model of government, this common Latin American culture reflects a strong central government and religion that have as their source similar colonial and economic histories (Cardoso & Faletto, 1979), a common language, and, for most (Spanish) Latin American countries, a common link to Spain (Zea, 1963). However, while sharing similar values, each country exhibits singular cultural elements that make it unique (Romero, 2004). Gaining a deeper understanding of the complexities of the leadership processes in Latin America will offer both academics and practitioners valuable tools when managing within the Latin American business environment. The profiles offered here provide the most extensive description of cultural values and leadership expectations in Latin American countries published thus far. This paper reports data from the GLOBE Project, which was designed to assess both similarities and differences in the definition of leadership around the world, in order to compare and contrast consistent measures of leadership and cultural values in eleven Latin American countries.

Project GLOBE Data Collection Methods

The GLOBE project encompassed a survey of 17,000 middle managers from 951 organizations within three industries (i.e., food, telecommunications, and banking industries), from 62 societies (House et al., 2004). Societies were grouped into ten culture clusters based on the history of the societies under consideration, as well as on religious, linguistic, and economic similarities (Gupta and Hanges, 2004). Using cluster analysis, Gupta and Hanges (2004) found that all ten of the Latin countries in the original GLOBE study – Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, and Venezuela – belonged to one culture cluster. Since the initial societal-level data were published, additional data have been collected in multiple countries using the same methodology for the original data collection. In this paper, we include data for Peru[1]. Thus, in this analysis for Latin America, there were a total of 1903 middle managers from 11 countries who participated in the study.

One of the central propositions behind GLOBE's theory is that societal culture influences acceptable and effective leadership in a society (Dorfman, Hanges, & Brodbeck, 2004). Thus, a major question that GLOBE researchers sought to address was the extent to which specific leader characteristics and actions are universally endorsed as contributing to effective leadership, as well as how these qualities and actions are linked to cultural characteristics (House & Javidan, 2004). As explained by Dorfman, Hanges, and Brodbeck (2004), societal values and practices influence people's shared beliefs about leaders. Over time, people develop shared schemas, or prototypes, as part of the socialization process that occurs within the society (Lord & Maher, 1991). These shared leadership schemas or prototypes at the societal level are what GLOBE researchers refer to as c*ulturally endorsed implicit leadership theory* (CLT; Dorfman et al., 2004).

CLT is an extension of implicit leadership theory (ILT) to a culture-level theory that focuses on the shared beliefs about effective leaders among members of an organization or society (Dorfman et al., 2004). ILT specifies that individuals hold a set of beliefs about the kinds of attributes, personality characteristics, skills, and behaviors that relate to outstanding leadership (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984). Ultimately, these belief systems are thought to affect how individuals in a society accept and respond to others as leaders (Lord & Maher, 1991).

Based on a qualitative and quantitative research process, results showed 112 behavioral and attribute descriptors that were thought to contribute to, or impede, outstanding leadership (Dorfman et al., 2004). These behavioral and attribute descriptors were statistically grouped into 21 first-order primary leadership factors (i.e., first-order CLTs) that were then consolidated into six second-order global leadership dimensions (i.e., second-order CLTs). The scales used to rate different

---

[1] Basic analyses were conducted to ensure that the data from Peru is comparable to data from the other countries. We looked at statistical descriptives as well as a confirmatory analysis done on the data. Fit is acceptable and Factor loadings are similar to those of other countries

leadership attributes ranged from (1) *greatly inhibits outstanding leadership* to (7) *greatly contributes to outstanding leadership* (Hanges and Dickson, 2004). Table 1 displays each of the six global leadership dimensions for Latin America, along with the first-order primary leadership factors and the corresponding individual attributes and behavioral descriptors. The information in this table is presented in descending order from the second-order CLTs global leadership dimensions that were considered to contribute the most to outstanding leadership to the CLTs that were considered to contribute the least to outstanding leadership in Latin America.

Results: Leadership in Latin America

Positive Universal Leadership Attributes

Project GLOBE identified leader characteristics that were considered to be positive attributes in all 62 societies included in the study[2] (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Several attributes (first-order CLTs) that reflect *inspirational*[3] and *visionary* leadership were found to contribute to outstanding leadership in all Latin American countries. Similar to the other countries included in the GLOBE study, an *inspirational* leader in Latin America is a confidence builder, dynamic, motive arouser, positive, and encouraging. Further, across the 62 countries, although being a *visionary* leader includes planning ahead and having foresight, in Latin America it is also associated with being inspiring, having a vision, and being able to anticipate and being future-oriented.

Much like all other societies in the GLOBE study, outstanding leaders in the Latin American region display attributes of *team integration*. As such, leaders exhibiting team integrating characteristics are those who build a team, coordinate, communicate and inform followers. Although different than most of the countries included in the GLOBE study, leaders exhibiting team integration characteristics in Latin America also place a greater emphasis on integrating and building cohesive groups.

Among other primary CLT attributes that contribute to outstanding leadership in the region are *administratively competent*, *integrity*, *performance-oriented*, *collaborative*, *diplomatic, decisiveness*, *self-sacrifice,* and *malevolent*. Notably, several first-order CLTs were not consistently considered universally outstanding across the 62 societies, but were considered outstanding across all Latin American countries. These attributes include: being a good administrator, improvement-oriented, group-oriented, collaborative, diplomatic, and convincing. A complete picture of the attributes that constitute an outstanding leader across Latin American countries can be seen in Table 2. The characteristics that are in bold represent leadership attributes that are uniquely relevant to Latin America.

[2] The criteria for a universally endorsed attribute contributing to outstanding leadership in the original GLOBE study were as follows: (a) 95% of the societal averages for an attribute had to exceed a mean of 5 on a 7-point scale, and (b) the worldwide grand mean score for that attribute had to exceed 6 on a 7-point scale. These same criteria were used in the current paper to look for attributes of outstanding leadership that are endorsed by respondents in Latin America, regardless of their country.

[3] First-order CLTs are italicized

Negative Universal Leadership Attributes

Less desirable leader attributes were also identified by GLOBE[4] (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Most of the attributes that impede effective leadership in Latin America can be grouped into four primary first-order CLTs: *malevolent, face saver, self-centered*, and *autocratic*. There were also three other attributes (i.e., egocentric, distant, and ruthless) that did not load into any of the first-order factors, that were considered to impede effective leadership across Latin American countries. See Table 3 for a list of all the negative universal attributes in the region.

Although some of the universal impediments to effective leadership in the original GLOBE study reflect the same first-order CLTs as the ones found here (see House et al, 2004), the actual attributes that were considered to be negative vary somewhat for countries that make up the Latin America region. In particular, being cynical, vindictive, hostile, and dishonest (from the *malevolent* first-order CLT), and being indirect (from the *face-saver* first-order CLT) were attributes that describe impediments to effective leadership in Latin America, but not across the original 62 countries in the GLOBE study. All in all, these results shed some light on the actual behaviors that are perceived as impediments to effective leadership in Latin America and how they may differ from other regions of the world.

Culturally Contingent Behaviors by Country

Besides leadership attributes that are considered universal in Latin America (and in some cases across all 62 societies included in the GLOBE study), our analysis indicates that there are also leadership attributes that surface differentially across the region. Several culturally contingent attributes (i.e., behaviors that were seen as contributing to outstanding leadership in some countries, but seen to impede it in others) were identified[5]. Culturally contingent attributes are presented in Table 4.

The *intra-group conflict avoider* attribute ranged from 3.32 (slightly inhibits outstanding leadership) to 5.59 (somewhat contributes to outstanding leadership), showing that this attribute is perceived differently across countries. Although considered to somewhat contribute to outstanding leadership in most Latin American societies, this attribute is considered to also slightly inhibit outstanding leadership in Colombia, El Salvador, and Peru. In these countries, leaders may be expected to be more involved in intra-group conflict and not avert it.

---

[4] The criteria for a characteristic to be considered a universally negative attribute impeding outstanding leadership in the original GLOBE study were as follows: (a) 95% of the societal averages for an attribute had to be less than 3 on a 7-point scale (b) the attribute or item grand mean for all cultures had to be less than 3 on a 7-point scale. These same criteria were used in this paper to identify attributes impeding effective leadership as noted by respondents in Latin America, regardless of their country.

[5] To assess this, for each attribute a minimum and a maximum score was calculated. If an attribute score was above the midpoint of 4 for some countries and below for others, then that attribute was considered culturally contingent.

The *self-effacing* attribute ranged from 2.29 (somewhat inhibits) to 5.23 (slightly contributes). Being self-effacing (i.e., modest) is considered to be a positive attribute in many Latin American countries, except in Venezuela where this trait shows no impact on outstanding leadership. However in Argentina, Bolivia, and Mexico being self-effacing is considered to somewhat inhibit outstanding leadership. Perhaps in these countries showing modesty is less acceptable in their leaders; instead, they may enact behaviors that are somewhat more brash and strident.

The *habitual* leadership attribute ranged from 2.77 (slightly inhibits) to 5.38 (slightly contributes). In Bolivia, being habitual was considered to slightly contribute to outstanding leadership. However, in the majority of the Latin American countries in the sample it was considered to inhibit outstanding leadership, except in Argentina and Guatemala where it did not impact outstanding leadership. Largely, leaders who are slightly less bureaucratic and procedural are preferred, except in Bolivia where this is seen as more positive, possibly perceived as being routine or practical.

In most Latin American countries being *willful* (i.e., determined) is considered a positive attribute. Leaders with determined and decisive attributes are desired, with the exception of Colombia where this attribute is considered to slightly inhibit outstanding leadership. Possibly, in Colombia this attribute may be interpreted as being somewhat inflexible for leaders. Conversely, in most Latin American countries being *autonomous* is considered to somewhat inhibit outstanding leadership (or has no impact). Thus, leaders appearing independent and those who separate from their followers are perceived as less effective in most of these societies, except for Argentina where it is considered to slightly contribute to effective leadership.

Further, in specific Latin American societies results revealed several thought-provoking culturally contingent attributes. For instance, the attribute *class conscious* is perceived as slightly contributing to (or not having an impact on) outstanding leadership for most countries, except for Venezuela. Hence, being status conscious is perceived to slightly inhibit outstanding leadership in Venezuela. Furthermore, the attribute of *domineering* was considered to be either somewhat inhibiting to, or having no impact on outstanding leadership for most countries. In Venezuela however, this attribute was considered to slightly contribute to outstanding leadership. Taken together, these leadership attributes reveal a pattern of leader expectations that is less class conscious and less overbearing in this country.

The leadership attribute of being *worldly* (i.e., having a world outlook), is considered to slightly inhibit outstanding leadership in Brazil, but it is considered to somewhat contribute to outstanding leadership in other Latin America countries (except in Costa Rica and Guatemala where it shows no impact). Thus, Brazilians do not expect their leaders to enact diplomatic or worldly behaviors. It seems they seek leaders who are more focused on domestic and internal matters. Further, the attribute *provocateur* (i.e., stimulating unrest) was considered to somewhat inhibit outstanding leadership in most Latin American societies, except in Venezuela where this characteristic shows no impact. In Brazil, however, it is considered to

somewhat contribute to outstanding leadership. Thus to some extent, Brazilians expect their leaders to not be afraid to stir up controversy especially within their own society.

Being *cunning* is considered to slightly inhibit outstanding leadership in most of the Latin American societies, except in Venezuela where this trait is considered to have no impact on outstanding leadership. However, in Colombia and Peru it is considered to somewhat contribute; thus being calculating and astute tend to be desired leader characteristics in these societies. Furthermore, in most societies being a *micromanager* was considered to inhibit outstanding leadership to some extent. However, in Peru, it was considered to slightly contribute to outstanding leadership. It appears leaders are expected to keep somewhat of a close watch over their followers. Together, these attributes present a profile of a leader who is rather shrewd and watchful. Overall, these patterns offer insight into leadership nuances that exist in Latin America and challenges stereotypes that may suggest that all Latin Americans are similar. This research shows the complexity that exists in leadership perceptions across societies in Latin America.

Second-order CLTs

As mentioned, 21 first-order primary factors were grouped into six second-order global leadership dimensions: *charismatic/value-based, team-oriented, participative, humane-oriented, autonomous,* and *self-protective*. This second-order clustering was completed during the GLOBE project phase 1 & 2 in order to identify more general styles of leadership perceived as effective across cultures. Results from the second-order CLTs will help paint an overall picture of the outstanding leadership characteristics in Latin America.

When analyzing the second-order CLTs in Latin America (see Table 5), we found that most of the countries value *charismatic/value-based* and *team-oriented* leadership behaviors primarily. Mean scores of all societies is 5.91 on both of these leadership dimensions, with the mean score for each society above 5.70 respectively. This finding indicates that in Latin America, people endorse *charismatic/value-based* leadership attributes, such as being visionary, inspirational, and future-oriented, as contributing to effective leadership. Similarly, *team-oriented* attributes, such as being a team builder and integrator, are also valued in Latin America as contributing to outstanding leadership. Several examples of Latin American leaders support the prevalence of this profile. Leaders such as Lula in Brazil exemplify the strong charismatic value-based traits.

Following *charismatic/value-based* and *team-oriented* leadership behaviors, in Latin America *participative* and *humane-oriented* leadership behaviors are also valued, however to a lesser extent. *Participative* leaders are non-autocratic and non-dictatorial. Although there is variability on some of these dimensions, leaders in these societies delegate tasks in an egalitarian way and often are not micro-managers. These regional leaders are wise to ensure that the groups feel included in decision making and that their views are given attention. *Humane-oriented* leaders are those who are generous,

compassionate, modest, calm and patient. In Latin America, the notion of 'simpatico', or being pleasant and agreeable, is important for leaders, even when these leaders exhibit stronger charismatic and team-oriented behaviors. Leaders such as Perón in Argentina typify participative and humane-oriented leader behaviors, although to a less extent than the charismatic value-based and team-oriented traits.

Lastly, the second-order leadership dimensions of *self-protective* and *autonomous* are perceived as having a somewhat neutral to slightly negative influence on effective leadership in Latin America. Self-protective leaders are self-centered, status conscious, conflict inducer, face saver, and procedural. Leaders who make sovereign decisions and don't engage the followers are generally less desired, with the overall Latin American average score of 3.49 out of 7 point scale. Although most of these characteristics are thought to impede outstanding leadership, specific attributes (i.e., habitual, evasive, and class conscious) are seen as more favorable in some countries in the region than in others, as highlighted above. Similarly, an autonomous leadership style is perceived as contributing to an outstanding leadership style depending on the country.

In summary, an outstanding leader in the Latin America region tends to engage in *charismatic/value-based* and *team-oriented* leadership yet would not be adverse to some elements of self-protective leadership. Generally, exhibiting behavior such as independent action that is characteristic of autonomous leadership is not endorsed, though in some countries it would not be perceived as an inhibitor to outstanding leadership. *Participative* and *humane-oriented* leadership behaviors would be perceived favorably, but not to the extent that the *charismatic/value-based* and *team-oriented* leadership would (Dorfman et al., 2004). Results for the second-order factors for Latin America are given in Table 5 as well as the sample size for each country.

Discussion

The increased interaction between Latin America and other parts of the world (e.g., Free Trade Agreements between the U.S. and countries like Colombia and Peru; potential European Union and Latin America Free Trade Agreement) calls for more knowledgeable managers who can work in a Latin American cultural context. Although prior GLOBE studies summarize overall results for all cultures, a focused analysis of Latin America had not been previously conducted. The purpose of this paper was to profile the Latin American region in terms of expectations of effective leadership, as well as describe the relationship of cultural values with leadership styles for this subset of the world's cultures. Furthermore, conducting this study allowed us to not only examine the original ten countries in the Latin American cluster of the GLOBE study, but also incorporate recently collected data from Peru. Thus, a more comprehensive view of the region is provided. The current study provides insight into understanding how differences in global leadership styles are enacted across countries in Latin America and the similarities and nuances that exist across the countries in the region.

Similar to the results found by other scholars (Den Hartog, et al., 1999; House et al., 2004), our results indicate that charismatic/values-based (also known as transformational) leadership is likely to be a widespread phenomenon which is not exclusively appreciated in western societies. Though some attributes expected from outstanding leaders in Latin America are similar to those envisaged from leaders from other parts of the world, other attributes are more exclusive to this region. For example, being inspiring, visionary, future-oriented, anticipatory, convincing, and improvement-oriented are consistently recognized as effective by the managers in all Latin America countries studied, but not necessarily in other countries of the world. Conversely, Latin Americans perceive being indirect as detracting from leadership effectiveness. Finally, it is important to highlight that there are some attributes that are perceived as effective in one country but not in another, such as willful and risk-taking aspects of charismatic leadership. These findings provide empirical support for Bass' (1997) argument that while leadership styles can be universal (e.g., transformational leadership), the actual behavioral enactment of universal leadership styles can differ across locations due to thought processes, implicit understandings, or common behaviors present in one culture but not in another.

Team-oriented leadership is also highly valued in Latin America, and again, unique characteristics were found to be consistently perceived as effective in Latin America, but not necessarily shared in all other regions of the world. These attributes include being a good administrator, integrator, group-oriented, collaborative, and diplomatic. It is also important to note that attributes such as being a worldly leader and being a leader that avoids intra-group conflict showed variability between countries. Hence, diplomacy and collaboration are appreciated in organizational leaders in all Latin American countries studied, yet global mindsets and facing conflict require understanding country by country norms and attitudes.

Implications

These results could be a starter guide for managers working in the region to understand the leadership expectations of co-workers or employees from countries within Latin America. Managers who are aware of the culture's values, for instance, can be more intentional in terms of their leadership practices and likely effects on the daily operations and even crisis-management of an organization (Dorfman et al., 2004). Acknowledgement and explanation before a cultural value is breached can help diminish differences and build trust between the manager and employees.

Furthermore, knowledge about cultural similarities and nuances can also help organizations in terms of personnel selection, and training and development programs for employees who will interact with people from other cultures (Dickson, Castaño, Magomaeva, and Den Hartog, 2012). It can also help tweak selection systems and training and development programs so they take into account what people in Latin America are likely to value. A common application can be in the design of selection tools and personnel assessments for expatriates based on the fit between expatriate's values, belief system, and leadership concepts with the values and expectations from the host country (Dorfman, et al., 2004). Knowledge in this

area can also be applied by managers who lead cross-cultural teams. To increase leadership effectiveness, these managers need to be aware of the local culture, particularly in a virtual setting where non-verbal communication is minimized (Dickson et al., 2012).

In sum, from this research, managers will be able to understand (a) leadership styles that are valued across the globe (b) specific leadership attributes that are valued across Latin American countries in the study, but not necessarily in other regions of the world, and (c) leadership attributes that are valued in some Latin American countries, but not in others. Having this knowledge will allow managers to adapt more easily in employee expectations for leadership in different Latin American countries.

Limitations and Future Research

Despite its strengths, this study has several limitations. First, eleven out of 20 countries in Latin America were studied. Although we were fortunate to collect additional data for Peru for this analysis, there remain other countries that would be important to compare perceptions of leadership. Second, due the nested data structure of this type of data, ideally multilevel modeling would be used to estimate variation and effects of the country-level factors on perceptions of leadership styles. However, due to small sample sizes, multiple regression analyses at the individual level of analysis were conducted, and therefore standard errors of the regression coefficients may be underestimated in Table 10 and could result in increased type I errors.

Similar to most archival data studies, in the present study we were subject to the data available. Future research should focus on collecting more data in additional Latin American countries, and boosting sample sizes so that multilevel modeling can be conducted for more accurate statistical significance testing. Furthermore, future research could include measures of leadership *effectiveness* and test a mediation model of cultural values to culturally implicit leadership styles to leader effectiveness, as well as compare results across Latin American countries. Such results would shed light not only on the leadership preferences in Latin America, but confirm which styles actually drive leadership effectiveness (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

Conclusions

Business leaders working in Latin America, and especially those planning on being mobile within the region, need to recognize the similarities and nuances that are present across Latin American countries. Although there are universal expectations for leadership within the region, there are also culturally contingent leadership attributes. Those leaders who are aware of these differences and adapt their behaviors accordingly are most likely to be perceived as effective. Furthermore, taking into account how culture impacts perceptions of leadership effectiveness may help leaders form a better picture of how to manage complexities across cross-cultural contexts that include Latin American cultures.

References

Abarca, N., Mujluf, N., & Rodriguez, D. (1998). Identifying management in Chile: A behavioural approach. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, *28*, 18-37.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52,* 130-139.

Camacho-Garcia, M. A. (1996). *Análisis organizacional del las Pymexas Metalmec nicas de Cochabamba*. Cochabamba, U.M. San Simons: FCEyS.

Cardoso, F. H. & Faletto, E. (1979), *Dependency and development in Latin America*. University of California Press.

Chhokar, J. S., Brodbeck, F.C. & House, R.J. (2007). *Culture and Leadership across the World: The GLOBE Book of In-Depth Studies of 25 Societies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Davila, A. & Elvira, M. (2012). Humanistic leadership: Lessons from Latin America. *Journal of World Business*, *47,* 548 - 554.

Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(2)*,* 219-257.

Dickson, M.W. Castano, N., Magomaeva, A. & Den Hartog, D.N. (2012). Conceptualizing Leadership Across Cultures. *Journal of World Business, 47* (4)*,* 483 – 492.

Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2004). Leadership and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed leadership profiles. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, and V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 668 - 720)*.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. (1997). Managerial leadership in the United States and Mexico: Distant neighbors or close cousins? In C.S. Granrose & Oskamp (Eds.), *Cross Cultural Workgroups* (pp. 234-264). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorfman, P., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dastmalchian, and House, R. (2012) GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business*.

Elvira, M. M. and Dávila, A. (2012). Globalization and Sustainable Leadership. In J. Canals (Ed.). *Leadership Development for a Global World: The Role of Companies and Business Schools* (pp. 163-187). UK: Palgrave Macmillian.

Gupta,V. & Hanges, P. J. (2004). Regional and climate clustering of societal cultures. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M.

Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, and V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 178 - 218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Esmer, Y, & Pettersson, T. (2007). *Measuring and Mapping Cultures: 25 Years of Comparative Values Surveys.* Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Hanges, P.J., & Dickson, M.W. (2004). The development and validation of the GLOBE culture and leadership scales, In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, and V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 121 - 151). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Heine, S.J., & Ruby, M.B. (2010). Cultural psychology. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science, 1*(2), 254-266.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House, R. J. & Javidan, M. (2004). In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, and V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (9 - 28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hox, JJ. (1995). *Applied multilevel analysis*. Amsterdam: TT-Publikaties.

Inglehart, R. & Carballo, M. (1997). "Does Latin America exist? A Global Analysis of Cross-Cultural Differences." *Perfiles Latinoamericanos*, *16* (31), 13-38.

Kras, E. S. (1994). *Modernizing Mexican management style: With insights for U.S. companies working in Mexico*. Las Cruces, NM: Editts Publishing.

Lenartowicz, T & James J. (2002). Managerial Values in Latin America: A Twelve-Nation Comparative Study. *Management International Review*, *42* (3), 279-307.

Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., & DeVader, C. L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 34*, 343-378.

Lord, R. & Maher, K. L. (1991). Leadership and Information processing: Linking perceptions and performance. Boston: Unwin-Everyman.

Lozano, E. (1997). The cultural experience of space and body: A reading of Latin American and Anglo American comportment in public. In A. Gonzalez, M. Houston, & V. Chen (Eds.), *Our voices: Essays in culture, ethnicity, and communication* (2nd ed; pp. 195-202). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.

Martinez, P. G. (2005). Paternalism as a positive form of leadership in the Latin American context: Leader benevolence, decision-making control and human resource management practices. In M. Elvira & A. Davila (Eds.), *Managing human resources in Latin America: An agenda for international leaders* (pp. 75-93). Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Majul, L. (1992). Los Dueños de la Argentina: La cara oculta de los negocios. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Sudamericana.

Ogliastri, E., McMillen, C., Altschul, C., Arias, M.E., Bastamente, C., Davila, C., Dorfman, P., Ferreira, M., Finmen, C. and

Martinez, S. (1999). Cultura y liderazgo organizacional en 10 paises de America Latina. El estudio Globe.

Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración, *22*, 29–57.

Ogliastri, E. (1998). Culture and organizational leadership in Colombia. Retrieved from http://www.hs-

fulda.de/fileadmin/Fachbereich_SW/Downloads/Profs/Wolf/Studies/colombian/colombian.pdf

Pellegrini, E. K. & Scandura, T. A. (2008). Paternalistic Leadership: A review and agenda for future research. *Journal of*

Management, *34*, 566-593.

Recht, R., & Wilderom, C. (1998). Latin American's dual reintegration. *International Studies of Management &*

Organization, 28, 3-17.

Romero, Eric J. (2004). Latin American leadership: El Patrón & El Líder Moderno. *Cross Cultural Management: An*

International Journal, *11*, 25 – 37.

Ronen, S. & Shenkar, O. (1985). Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: A review and synthesis. *Academy of*

Management Review, 10, 435 - 454.

Schwartz, S. H. (2006). Value orientations: Measurement, antecedents and consequences across nations. In R. Jowell, C.

Roberts, R. Fitzgerald, & G. Eva (Eds.), *Measuring attitudes cross-nationally - lessons from the European Social*

Survey. London: Sage.

Veliz, C. (1980). *The Centralist Tradition of Latin America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a contested concept: populism in the study of Latin American politics. *Comparative politics*,

34(1), 1-22.

Zea, L. (1963). *The Latin-American Mind*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press

Table 1

Leadership Prototypes: Second-Order Factors, First-Order Factors, and Leader Attributes and Behaviors

Second-Order/Global Leadership Dimension	First Order Factors	Leader Attributes and Behaviors
Charismatic/Value-Based Leadership: A leadership dimension that reflects ability to inspire, to motivate, and to expect high performance outcomes from others based on firmly held values.	Visionary	Foresight, prepared, anticipatory, plans ahead
	Inspirational	Enthusiastic, positive, morale booster, motive arouser
	Self-sacrifice	Risk-taker, self-sacrificial, convincing
	Integrity	Honest, sincere, just, trustworthy
	Decisive	willful, decisive, logical, intuitive
	Performance Oriented	Improvement-oriented, excellence-oriented, performance-oriented
Team-Oriented Leadership: A leadership dimension that emphasizes effective team building and implementation of a common purpose or goal among team members.	Collaborative team orientation	Group-oriented, collaborative, loyal, consultative
	Team integrator	Communicative, team builder, informed, integrator
	Diplomatic	Diplomatic, worldly, win-win problem solver, effective bargainer
	Malevolent (reverse coded)	Hostile, dishonest, vindictive, irritable
	Administratively competent	orderly, administratively skilled, organized, good administrator
Participative Leadership: A leadership dimension that reflects the degree to which managers involve others in making and implementing decisions.	Nonparticipative (reverse coded)	nondelegator, micromanager, nonegalitarian, individually oriented
	Autocratic (reverse coded)	Autocratic, dictatorial, bossy, elitist
Humane-Oriented Leadership: A leadership dimension that reflects supportive and considerate leadership but also includes compassion and generosity.	Modesty	Modest, self-effacing, patient
	Humane orientation	Generous, compassionate
Autonomous Leadership: A newly defined leadership dimension that refers to independent and individualistic leadership attributes.	This dimension is measured by a single subscale labeled autonomous leadership	individualistic, independent, autonomous, unique
Self-Protective Leadership: From a Western perspective, this newly defined leadership behavior focuses on ensuring the safety and security of the individual and group through status enhancement and face saving.	Self-centered	self-centered, nonparticipative, loner, asocial
	Status-conscious	status-conscious, class-conscious
	Conflict inducer	normative, secretive, intragroup competitor
	Face saver	indirect, avoids negatives, evasive
	Procedural	Ritualistic, formal, habitual, procedural

Table 2
Universal Positive Leader Attributes in Latin America

First Order CLTs	Item	5th Percentile	Mean	SD
Charismatic II: Inspirational				
Table 3	Confidence builder	5.83	6.27	1.10
	Dynamic	6.14	6.40	1.02
	Motive Arouser	5.85	6.39	1.11
	Encouraging	5.85	6.25	1.14
	Positive	5.43	6.02	1.42
Charismatic I: Visionary				
	Plans ahead	5.78	6.20	1.08
	Inspirational	**6.00**	**6.27**	**1.28**
	Able to anticipate	**5.90**	**6.13**	**1.11**
	Visionary	**5.68**	**6.06**	**1.24**
	Foresight	5.76	6.02	1.13
	Future-oriented	**5.77**	**6.02**	**1.17**
Team II: Team Integrator				
	Communicative	5.95	6.30	1.08
	Coordinator	6.00	6.27	1.07
	Informed	5.73	6.30	1.04
	Team builder	5.90	6.27	1.17
	Integrator	**5.74**	**6.09**	**1.27**
Administratively Competent				
	Administratively Skilled	5.87	6.30	1.24
	Good administrator	5.53	6.15	1.09
Integrity				
	Trustworthy	5.84	6.37	1.17
	Honest	5.21	6.29	1.25
	Just	5.82	6.22	1.22
Performance-oriented				
	Improvement-oriented	**6.11**	**6.32**	**1.18**
	Excellence-oriented	5.83	6.39	1.08
Team I: Collaborative team orientation				
	Group oriented	**5.51**	**6.16**	**1.17**
	Collaborative	**5.98**	**6.15**	**1.11**
Diplomatic				
	Win/win problem-solver	5.68	6.13	1.27
	Diplomatic	**5.08**	**6.01**	**1.50**
Decisiveness				
	Decisive	6.00	6.30	1.16
Self-sacrifice				
	Convincing	**5.65**	**5.99**	**1.24**
Malevolent (reverse coded)				
	Dependable	5.36	6.24	1.17

Note: **Bold attributes** = universal characteristics in Latin America, but not across the 62 societies included in the original study.
Universal positive status of attributes in Latin America are based on the following criteria:
  a) Mean ratings across countries > 6.00
  b) 5th percentile > 5.00
SD = Standard deviation

Universal Negative Leader Attributes in Latin America

First Order CLTs	Item	95th Percentile	Mean	SD
Malevolent				
	Irritable	2.53	1.98	1.30
	Cynical	**2.43**	**1.76**	**1.35**
	Vindictive	**2.19**	**1.71**	**1.31**
	Hostile	**2.04**	**1.49**	**1.20**
	Dishonest	**1.90**	**1.43**	**1.14**
Self-Centered				
	Loner	2.52	2.02	1.36
Autocratic				
	Elitist	2.93	2.37	1.55
Face Saver				
	Indirect	**3.00**	**2.68**	**1.51**
	Non-explicit	2.97	2.39	1.45
Other Items				
	Egocentric	2.73	2.05	1.37
	Distant	2.39	1.90	1.24
	Ruthless	2.45	1.93	1.51

Note: **Bold Attributes** = universal characteristics in Latin America, but not across the 62 societies included in the original study.
Universal negative status of attributes in Latin America are based on the following criteria:
    a) Mean ratings across countries < 3.00
    b) 95th percentile < 3.00
SD = Standard deviation

Table 4
Culturally Contingent CLT Attributes in Latin America

First Order CLTs	Item	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Diplomatic					
	Intra-group conflict avoider	3.32	5.59	4.46	1.97
	Worldly	3.48	5.70	4.87	1.67
Autocratic					
	Domineering	2.05	4.54	3.25	1.89
Conflict Inducer					
	Intra-group competitor	3.87	5.55	4.79	1.91
Decisive					
	Willful	3.29	6.41	4.99	2.04

Modesty					
	Self-effacing	2.29	5.23	4.30	1.86
Procedural/Bureaucratic					
	Habitual	2.77	5.38	3.34	1.62
Self-sacrifice					
	Risk taker	3.58	5.96	4.41	1.95
Status Conscious					
	Class conscious	3.34	5.76	4.58	1.81
Face Saver					
	Evasive	2.89	4.65	3.44	1.96
Autonomous					
	Autonomous	1.63	4.59	3.34	2.01
Other Items					
	Cunning	2.12	6.38	3.93	2.37
	Micro Manager	1.60	4.83	3.40	1.97
	Provocateur	1.57	5.70	3.01	2.08

Note: Culturally contingent attributes are those that have a range above and below the scale mid-point (i.e., 4) depending on the country; SD = Standard deviation

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations - Second Order CLTs for Latin America

	N	Charismatic/value-based		Team Oriented		Participative		Humane Oriented		Autonomous		Self-Protective	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Argentina	153	5.98	0.35	5.97	0.38	5.89	0.70	4.70	0.66	4.55	1.09	3.46	0.59
Bolivia	102	6.01	0.50	6.08	0.46	5.30	0.96	4.56	0.79	3.92	1.11	3.83	0.58
Brazil	263	6.00	0.49	6.15	0.36	6.06	0.74	4.84	0.96	2.27	0.79	3.50	0.60
Colombia	290	6.04	0.53	6.05	0.46	5.51	0.84	5.05	0.86	3.34	1.08	3.37	0.60
Costa Rica	115	5.95	0.99	5.80	0.82	5.54	1.04	4.99	1.08	3.46	1.16	3.55	0.60
Ecuador	49	6.46	0.33	6.18	0.35	5.51	0.88	5.13	0.96	3.53	1.22	3.63	0.52
El Salvador	26	6.08	0.74	5.94	0.71	5.40	1.08	4.69	1.01	3.47	1.06	3.44	0.81
Guatemala	112	6.00	0.76	5.92	0.71	5.45	1.10	5.00	0.99	3.38	1.07	3.77	0.58
Mexico	310	5.66	0.84	5.74	0.87	4.64	1.02	4.71	0.89	3.86	1.21	3.86	0.69
Peru	313	5.85	0.68	5.76	0.63	5.37	0.90	4.85	0.93	3.73	1.03	3.40	0.69
Venezuela	142	5.72	0.76	5.62	0.75	4.89	1.04	4.85	0.89	3.39	1.06	3.82	0.58
Latin America	1875	5.91	0.68	5.91	0.64	5.39	1.02	4.85	0.91	3.49	1.22	3.49	1.22